

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/7112/P	Emily and Jay Bhattacharjee	30/08/2018 20:59:14	OBJ	<p>We would like to object to this planning application. We are owner occupiers on Busby Place and feel the area is already under significant pressure with regard to parking and facilities. Due to its previous misguided and ultimately rejected development, this property has a useless dropped curb which essentially removes two parking spaces. This leaves insufficient space for the existing residents of the street. Further development would drastically increase this pressure on parking. The area is already highly populated and not able to cope with an increased density of dwellings. This proposal would therefore significantly reduce the quality of life for those residents in the near vicinity of number 20. Furthermore, the substantial waste and recycling requirements of such a development would greatly reduce the aesthetics of the terrace as a whole. We urge the council to reject this application</p>

Application No: 2017/7112/P
 Consultees Name: Alec Berry
 Received: 30/08/2018 13:25:16
 Comment: OBJ

Response:

We wish to oppose planning application 2017/7112/P relating to 20 Busby Place

I refer to the following extract from the Delegated Report on Planning Application 2018/0500/P relating to 20 Busby Place:

52.9. As mentioned at the beginning of the report, the host dwelling is situated at the end of a row of terrace properties, which exhibit clear consistency in their design and character, and positively add to the streetscene. One element of this consistency, and a contributing factor to the group character, is the treatment to front boundaries that is uniform for the entire terrace. The regular pattern of painted dwarf brick walls, brick piers and painted metal railings with decorative finials define the front boundary in a clear and uniform manner and add to the character of the terrace. The removal of a full section of this boundary treatment to the end of the terrace is considered to sever this uniformity and to breach the definitions of space to the front of the dwelling. This loss, combined with the visual clutter of parked cars to the front of the site is considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene, but also to undermine the group character of the terrace. The proposed works are consequently contrary to policy D1 of the Local Plan and policy D3 of the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan (2016).

That planning application was refused on 9 July 2018 inter alia for those reasons.

The works envisaged by planning application 2017/7112/P would similarly substantially detract from the group character of the terrace and the street scene for the following reasons.

The drawings of the front elevation accompanying the planning application assert that no change is proposed to that elevation. However the proposed ground floor plan clearly indicate an intention to create an additional front door to give access to the extension to 20 Busby Place, and suggest that the window is both to be moved to the left (so as no longer to align vertically with the window above) and narrowed. That would further degrade the symmetry of the design of the façade of the terrace.

The planning application envisages the creation of a 'waste and recycle bin store', apparently for twelve wheeled bins, and a 'secure cycle store' for six bicycles. It is not clear whether the wheeled bins are to be housed in some form of store, or the bicycles to be housed in some form of shed. In the absence of detailed drawings one cannot be sure how much space would be required to store and manoeuvre the bins and bicycles, but so far as we can judge at least the bulk of the forecourt would be required for this purpose. There is also the question of access to and from the pavement, particularly given the three steps on the path to the front door (which might lead in practice to wheeled bins being left for extended periods on the pavement). All in all, the result would be a substantial increase in detrimental visual clutter.

We therefore ask the Council, consistently with its earlier decision, also to refuse this application.

Alec Berry
 Margaret Berry